

**Items for Discussion with Cynthia
September 29, 2000**

Freight Mobility Roundtable

FAA Projects

Runway Shift Project for 2001
13L/31R

EIS/BA

Surveying

UPS

Steam Plant Access

Boeing Mtg. – Monday

Noel Treat

Suggested Process for Steam Plant Access

1. Meeting between the 3 parties and agreement on concept
2. Letter of Intent
3. Section 106 Consultation
4. Survey
5. Value Assessment
6. Environmental Audit
7. Negotiations
8. Settlement

Runway Team Meeting Notes
March 23, 2001

Survey – The runway is presently being resurveyed to check what were known control points prior to the earthquake. A full report will be available by March 23rd. Update: Reid Middleton has determined that there was enough movement during the earthquake that they cannot rely on the earlier survey points. Therefore, they will be conducting another survey this week.

Grading – The slope of the ground within the Runway Safety Area exceeds the 5% allowed by FAA (it is generally a 10% slope). It is estimated that about 360 cubic yards of soil must be removed. Pavement, which is presently serving as apron around the runway, must also be removed. It is breaking up and contributes to the FOD problem. It will be removed and replanted with sod. Conversations with DDES have indicated that a Grading Permit must be issued because the 100 cubic yard threshold will be exceeded. They also indicated that a quick turn around would occur because they are aware of the project.

SEPA Checklist – The threshold for a SEPA checklist submittal is the grading of 500 cubic yards or greater. It is suspected that grading will not exceed this threshold but an environmental determination will have to be made (says attorney Noel Treat). Lynn Leweki of DCFM has been contacted and made aware of the project and its status. She agrees that a checklist should be completed and kept in the file even if not required. As the project is further defined, Reid Middleton will revise the draft SEPA checklist.

Taxiways

Tie Ins – Cost estimates are needed for the tie in points to taxiways (especially taxiway A-3). These are the stub taxiways which cross the runway. The question is...What would it take to bring them up to FAA standards? (translated into how much \$) Design problems were identified prior to the earthquake (slope of pavement) and it is suspected that there may be additional issues that must be addressed now.

Taxiways A-4, A-7, and the new A-3 – The weight bearing capacity has been found to be less than that required for the heavy aircraft using (or proposed to use – in the case of new A-3) those taxiways. It is anticipated that the cost to upgrade these taxiways will cost \$150,000 each. These areas only include where the taxiways cross the runway. Additional funds will be needed in a separate project to bring the rest of the taxiway pavement up to strength. A decision on these costs will be needed from the airport. Total project cost should be sent to the FAA as soon as they are formulated.

The Painting Plan is to be revised to insure proper threshold location.

Safety Plan – Discussions will take place with the ATC control tower to get their input on the construction and safety plans. The plan will be submitted to the FAA Airports District Office (ADO) for further review and approval.

Earthquake Damage

The project has been on schedule up to the earthquake occurrence. An additional survey is anticipated to delay the project at least one week. Other delays are still being assessed. A new schedule is to be established by the airport and Reid Middleton by Friday March 30, 2001.

Drainage – There have been ongoing discussions about the need to construct drains as a part of this project. The FAA has determined that drains will need to be constructed because some of the soil in the area appears to be saturated with water.

Note: Water contamination samples are due in to Rick Renaud soon. This information may influence the placement of drainage points and should be considered in the design.

Boil – A pavement boil has been found on taxiway A-6 adjacent to a major crack across the runway. This may affect the tie in to the taxiway. Special consideration to the sequencing of construction and maintenance needs should be given to this area.

Electrical

Electrical Vault – The capacity of the airport's present electrical vault will be reached with the completion of this project. The vault must be expanded if other transformers are to be added. It is estimated that the cost of a new vault will be around \$500,000. This will be necessary when the large runway is shifted to meet the additional electrical demand (REILS, Runway and Taxiway Lights, DTG Signs). It was suggested that we immediately work toward getting additional FAA funding for a new vault. This request will be added to the FAA application for the runway shift.

Other Electrical – Light fixtures will be raised where necessary. This may occur where grade changes occur. Estimates of cost and numbers will be established. Collars may be appropriate in many instances. The status of the lights will be established prior to the construction bid process.

Concrete Lids – Concrete covered manhole covers will be replaced where they are located within areas affected by the project.

Draft Construction Specifications were given to Sandy for review.

Agenda
Runway 13L/31R Overlay Project Team
January 17, 2001

Introductions

Work Scope Review

Project Schedule

FAA vs. County Standards

Meeting Dates

Other?

Preliminary Project Schedule
Runway 13L-31R Overlay and Upgrade

Done	Survey & Pavement Deflection Testing	02-Jan
Done	Conceptual Design & Coordination Meeting	17-Jan
	Intermediate Review Meeting	
	Final Review Meeting	
	Advertisement for Bids	04-Apr
	Bid Opening	02-May
	Begin Construction	13-Jun
	Complete Construction	12-Sep

**Notes from Meeting
Runway 13L/31R Overlay Project Team
January 17, 2001**

Attendees:

John Current, Mike Colmant, Rick Renaud, Jerry Bitterman, Mark Hella, Randy Hall, Karla Kendal, Sandy Anguelov

Introductions were made and Randy Hall, project manager (Reid Middleton), presented the project work scope. As a response, the following issues emerged for discussion:

Airfield Access

The electrical and geo-technical engineers will require access to the runway during the next few weeks. It appears that the geo-technical work will require runway closure. Reid Middleton (Randy Hall) will coordinate the runway closure with the airport (Mike Colmant) at least 2 weeks prior to the desired closure date to allow for appropriate notification to tenants etc.

The runway closure will be coordinated with Rick Renaud. Perhaps there will be an opportunity to simultaneously do some work in the vicinity of the runway for the new water system pipeline.

FAA Negotiations

There remains the need to further discuss the issue of the pavement strength of taxiway's A-4 and A-7 with the FAA. Large heavy aircraft cross the small runway there, but the FAA has not approved the evaluation of these pavements and their strengths as part of the project. Reid Middleton will assist in these discussions. John Current will schedule monthly meetings with the FAA for progress reporting.

Drainage

There may be FAA design requirements for a subsurface drainage system (Reid Middleton will confirm this). Rick Renaud showed some concern that a subsurface system might impact the location of known contaminants in the vicinity of the runway. Reid Middleton will coordinate with the airport once they know what the FAA design requirements are and after they have evaluated the need for drainage in this project. It will then be decided how to proceed with the drainage system design. There may be several options available to meet the FAA mandate.

PAPIs

Currently the small runway has VASIs. John will check to insure that PAPIs are included as a line item in the master plan CIP for future FAA funding.

SEPA Checklist

Mike re-emphasized the need to complete a SEPA checklist and submit it to DCFM. An appeal of this document can delay the whole project indefinitely. Reid Middleton will evaluate the design requirements for SEPA checklist submittal (how complete the design documents must be for submittal) and if possible, prepare a checklist prior to our next monthly meeting (mid February). John will also evaluate the submittal requirements and notify legal staff of the upcoming submittal.

A meeting will be scheduled for further internal discussion of this issue.

FAA vs. County Specifications

Reid Middleton will submit examples from previously completed FAA projects for review so that it can be determined if they meet County specifications. Sandy will insure that appropriate County personnel review them.

Next Meeting – to be scheduled for mid-February.
ATCT personnel will be invited.

Attendance Sheet
Runway Team Meeting
Feb 13, 2001

John Current
Karla Kendall Reid Middleton
L. Kelly Ha.
Mark Hella
SANDY ANGUELOV
Rick Rensud
JERRY BUTTERMAN

Phone #

205-8357

425 741-3800

(206) 296-7390

(206) 940-1683

(206) 296-7427

(206) 296-7390

AGENDA
Runway Overlay Project 13L/31R
March 21, 2001

- Project Status
- Re-Survey?
- Effects of the Earthquake
- Design
- Electrical Vault
- Taxiway Crossings
- SEPA Process
- Grading Permit
- Drainage
- DBE/MBE Requirements
- County Specification
- Schedule

- Other?

ATTENDANCE Sheet

MARCH 21, 2001

Karla Kendall Reid Middleton

RALPH WATTLES KCIA

Karen Miles FAA-Airports

JERRY BITTERMAN KCIA

Mark Hella KCIA

MIKE COLMANT KCIA

Rick Renaud KCIA

Reinhart Jung Reid Middleton

Landy Hall "

JERRY SCHNEIDER ELLEN ASSOC.

SANDY ANGUELOV KCOOT

Phone #

425 741-3800

206-296-7408

425-227-2661

206 296-7390

" "

206 296-7453

206 296-7427

425-741-3800

"

206-248-5022

(206) 940-1683

Post-It® Fax Note	7671	Date	3/22/01	# of pages	1
To	KAREN MILES	From	J. CURRENT		
Co./Dept.	SEA-ADO	Co.	KCIA		
Phone #	425-227-2661	Phone #	206-205-8357		
Fax #	425-227-1650	Fax #			

Runway Team Meeting Notes
March 23, 2001

Survey – The runway is presently being resurveyed to check what were known control points prior to the earthquake. A full report will be available by March 23rd. Update: Reid Middleton has determined that there was enough movement during the earthquake that they cannot rely on the earlier survey points. Therefore, they will be conducting another survey this week.

Grading – The slope of the ground within the Runway Safety Area exceeds the 5% allowed by FAA (it is generally a 10% slope). It is estimated that about 360 cubic yards of soil must be removed. Pavement, which is presently serving as apron around the runway, must also be removed. It is breaking up and contributes to the FOD problem. It will be removed and replanted with sod. Conversations with DDES have indicated that a Grading Permit must be issued because the 100 cubic yard threshold will be exceeded. They also indicated that a quick turn around would occur because they are aware of the project.

SEPA Checklist - The threshold for a SEPA checklist submittal is the grading of 500 cubic yards or greater. It is suspected that grading will not exceed this threshold but an environmental determination will have to be made (says attorney Noel Treat). Lynn Leweki of DCFM has been contacted and made aware of the project and its status. She agrees that a checklist should be completed and kept in the file even if not required. As the project is further defined, Reid Middleton will revise the draft SEPA checklist.

Taxiways

Tie Ins – Cost estimates are needed for the tie in points to taxiways (especially taxiway A-3). These are the stub taxiways which cross the runway. The question is...What would it take to bring them up to FAA standards? (translated into how much \$) Design problems were identified prior to the earthquake (slope of pavement) and it is suspected that there may be additional issues that must be addressed now.

Taxiways A-4, A-7, and the new A-3 – The weight bearing capacity has been found to be less than that required for the heavy aircraft using (or proposed to use – in the case of new A-3) those taxiways. It is anticipated that the cost to upgrade these taxiways will cost \$150,000 each. These areas only include where the taxiways cross the runway. Additional funds will be needed in a separate project to bring the rest of the taxiway pavement up to strength. A decision on these costs will be needed from the airport. Total project cost should be sent to the FAA as soon as they are formulated.

The Painting Plan is to be revised to insure proper threshold location.

Safety Plan – Discussions will take place with the ATC control tower to get their input on the construction and safety plans. The plan will be submitted to the FAA Airports District Office (ADO) for further review and approval.

Earthquake Damage

The project has been on schedule up to the earthquake occurrence. An additional survey is anticipated to delay the project at least one week. Other delays are still being assessed. A new schedule is to be established by the airport and Reid Middleton by Friday March 30, 2001.

Drainage – There have been ongoing discussions about the need to construct drains as a part of this project. The FAA has determined that drains will need to be constructed because some of the soil in the area appears to be saturated with water.

Note: Water contamination samples are due in to Rick Renaud soon. This information may influence the placement of drainage points and should be considered in the design.

Boil – A pavement boil has been found on taxiway A-6 adjacent to a major crack across the runway. This may affect the tie in to the taxiway. Special consideration to the sequencing of construction and maintenance needs should be given to this area.

Electrical

Electrical Vault – The capacity of the airport's present electrical vault will be reached with the completion of this project. The vault must be expanded if other transformers are to be added. It is estimated that the cost of a new vault will be around \$500,000. This will be necessary when the large runway is shifted to meet the additional electrical demand (REILS, Runway and Taxiway Lights, DTG Signs). It was suggested that we immediately work toward getting additional FAA funding for a new vault. This request will be added to the FAA application for the runway shift.

Other Electrical – Light fixtures will be raised where necessary. This may occur where grade changes occur. Estimates of cost and numbers will be established. Collars may be appropriate in many instances. The status of the lights will be established prior to the construction bid process.

Concrete Lids – Concrete covered manhole covers will be replaced where they are located within areas affected by the project.

Draft Construction Specifications were given to Sandy for review.

Current, John

From: Current, John
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2000 11:43 AM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Subject: RE: Airport Schedule

King County, of course.

From: Stahn, Joyce
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2000 11:38 AM
To: Current, John
Subject: RE: Airport Schedule

Good. Who is "we", the FAA or King County?

From: Current, John
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2000 10:59 AM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Subject: RE: Airport Schedule

Under NEPA the work is Categorical Excluded from any additional environmental processing. The ESA situation shouldn't be a problem, other development occurs in the area all the time. We just need to insure that we follow the proper process.

John

From: Stahn, Joyce
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2000 10:53 AM
To: Current, John
Cc: Lewicki, Lynn
Subject: FW: Airport Schedule

FYI - What is your take on the ESA matter? Our Department has a Environmental Coordinator and has Lead Agency status so our Director can sign off on all SEPA and ESA stuff. Does the FAA in fact handle this and is the schedule for ESA and any NEPA realistic?

From: Hlicker, Joe
Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2000 3:26 PM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Subject: Airport Schedule

Hi Joyce,

Here is the revised schedule for the airport paving project. This schedule assumes we don't need a permit from DDES per my communication with them this morning. Also, the schedule assumes any ESA review would be completed by the FAA during their review of the construction documents in June. Have a look and let me know what you think. Joe

<<File: Airport.MPP>>

Current, John

From: Current, John
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2000 11:14 AM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Subject: RE: Airport Cost breakdown

Ok. I Touched base with one of our engineers that did some costing in our master plan. They are projecting a \$1.5 million total project cost. He said generally 15-20 % would be acceptable engineering cost.

Your estimate of \$150,000 agrees with that assumption. We changed our estimate to reflect the \$1.5 million on the application that I sent to you. Please revise the engineering estimate to \$225,000 (15% of total cost).

From: Stahn, Joyce
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2000 11:05 AM
To: Current, John
Subject: FW: Airport Cost breakdown

Wait! I'm not done sending you messages yet. I'll gey you a cpyt of the SAOA form as well.

From: Hicker, Joe
Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2000 4:45 PM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Subject: Airport Cost breakdown

Hi Joyce,
Here is the consultant cost breakdown for the airport paving project. I also have the Subcontractor/Apprentice form completed. Do you want a copy of it or should I fax it to Keven Franklin?

<<File: Consultant Cost Breakdown.doc>>

Current, John

From: Stahn, Joyce
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2000 11:05 AM
To: Current, John
Subject: FW: Airport Cost breakdown

From: Hicker, Joe
Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2000 4:45 PM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Subject: Airport Cost breakdown

Hi Joyce,
Here is the consultant cost breakdown for the airport paving project. I also have the Subcontractor/Apprentice form completed. Do you want a copy of it or should I fax it to Keven Franklin?



Consultant Cost
Breakdown.doc

Current, John

From: Current, John
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2000 11:04 AM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Subject: FW: Runway 13L-31R Overlay

Please see comments below. This state is a NEPA like state. SEPA follows NEPA here in Washington. As I mentioned earlier, the project is Categorically Exempt under NEPA. FAA makes this determination.

From: Stahn, Joyce
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2000 10:59 AM
To: Current, John
Subject: FW: Runway 13L-31R Overlay

First, don't panic. The questions below don't need to be addressed prior to the RFQ, just needed to document the Exempt status of the construction for SEPA. File this away for later.

From: Lewicki, Lynn
Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2000 3:33 PM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Subject: Runway 13L-31R Overlay

Joyce:

King County should be the lead agency for the project if King County is sponsoring the project, which I assume is the case.

The project would be categorically exempt under SEPA (WAC 197-11-800) as a "repair, remodeling and maintenance activity." Please address the following: (1) Are the new runway lights and/or the distance-to-go lighted signs small-scale low-level lights or beacons? Yes. (2) Will the overlay materially expand the existing runway or change its use? No. (3) How close is the Duwamish inlet to the runway? 1 mile. I checked the SAO and the river is the only sensitive area I could find. SAO requires a minimum 100-foot buffer between the river (or its wetlands) and the project edge. If the runway is within 200 feet of the river, the project could trigger Shoreline review. (4) Is there

any anticipated change in drainage? No. I assume that since the project is for an overlay, the damage will remain the same.

As for NEPA, I've asked our SEPA attorney to send me a copy of the NEPA rules. It's possible that environmental review has already been done in a NEPA document to cover paving/overlayment projects.

Hope this is helpful. Lynn

Current, John

From: Current, John
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2000 10:59 AM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Subject: RE: Airport Schedule

Under NEPA the work is Categorical Excluded from any additional environmental processing. The ESA situation shouldn't be a problem, other development occurs in the area all the time. We just need to insure that we follow the proper process.

John

From: Stahn, Joyce
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2000 10:53 AM
To: Current, John
Cc: Lewicki, Lynn
Subject: FW: Airport Schedule

FYI - What is your take on the ESA matter? Our Department has a Environmental Coordinator and has Lead Agency status so our Director can sign off on all SEPA and ESA stuff. Does the FAA in fact handle this and is the schedule for ESA and any NEPA realistic?

From: Hicker, Joe
Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2000 3:26 PM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Subject: Airport Schedule

Hi Joyce,
Here is the revised schedule for the airport paving project. This schedule assumes we don't need a permit from DDES per my communication with them this morning. Also, the schedule assumes any ESA review would be completed by the FAA during their review of the construction documents in June. Have a look and let me know what you think. Joe

<<File: Airport.MPP>>

Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2000 3:26 PM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Subject: Airport Schedule

Hi Joyce,

Here is the revised schedule for the airport paving project. This schedule assumes we don't need a permit from DDES per my communication with them this morning. Also, the schedule assumes any ESA review would be completed by the FAA during their review of the construction documents in June. Have a look and let me know what you think. Joe



Airport.MPP

Current, John

From: Current, John
Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2000 5:00 PM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Subject: SCOPE OF WORK



Runway

311-13R-Revised_.doc

Returned with comments!!

Current, John

From: Stahn, Joyce
Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2000 1:06 PM
To: Current, John
Subject: Attachment
Importance: High



Airport Paving
RFQ.doc

This is the attachment that goes with the am messagef

rom me. Sorry about the confusion.

Current, John

From: Stahn, Joyce
Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2000 12:39 PM
To: Current, John
Subject: Airport Runway RFQ
Importance: High

Take a look at the attached. Hopefully, the changes are showing up in red. Note that I've addressed some of the changes as questions to you. If you could get this reviewed and your comments/changes back to my ASAP, I'll



Runway

311-13R-Revised.doc

forward it on to Stephen Saddler. Meanwhile I'll work on the criteria and submittal info.

Current, John

From: Stahn, Joyce
Sent: Wednesday, February 02, 2000 10:45 AM
To: Current, John
Subject: Airport Runway RFQ

I worked up a schedule yesterday with Joe Hicker. We need to wrap up this RFQ by this **Friday** in our effort to get the construction underway this season. Attached is a list of tasks that need to be done by Friday. I'll call you to discuss them. It looks like you won't need a permit from DDES, but there may be ESA (fish) requirements due to the location of the Airport in the Duwamish Corridor, and NEPA requirements. Therefore, the timeline is probably realistic. We could bid the project before we have these clearances/permits, but just not issue the Notice to Proceed. I'll get you the schedule (on Project software) and the revised Intro., Background and Scope as well as Criteria and Submittals sections by the end of the day. You and PCSS can review concurrently.

Current, John

From: Stewart, Cynthia
Sent: Thursday, January 27, 2000 2:39 PM
To: Stahn, Joyce
Cc: Napolitano, Jim; Current, John
Subject: Contracts Assistance

Joyce,

I have been told that there is an unresolved issue in the process of your assisting us with the RFP to get an

engineering firm to design the short runway pavement and lighting project. John Current indicated that you are saying you cannot help him proceed with moving the RFP through Procurement because the project manager is not here (out of town, ill, or whatever).

My understanding of the "rules of the game" for your assistance to us is that Procurement felt that your quality standards are so good and reliable that we need to use your service - and that they will not accept RFPs and contracts from Airport without going through your desk because of that - and that Jim Napolitano and Cheryl Fambles and I had agreed that Airport would use your help in processing A&E RFPs and contracts.

In my mind, this is not the same as the question of whether or not a DCPD project manager would be appointed for any given project. In cases where a DCPD project manager will also assist us, that is something that Jim and I or John Llewellyn and I will discuss.

Right now we really need your help to get this short runway RFP moving. The FAA has demanded that we get cost estimates very quickly, and we cannot afford to have this project bogged down for extraneous reasons. I have a separate e-mail to Jim asking about the person you referenced to John Current as the "project manager"; and I will conduct that conversation with him very soon. In the meantime, what else would be helpful to you to help us move this RFP forward?

Thank you for your assistance, and your prompt attention to this query.

- 61142

Fridges - 4257228 - 4262

John Beckman - UPS

(916) 719-6150

W 925-277-2229

ANGIE

(415) 347-7341

SAT.
11:30 - 7:45 PM
Machans

Joyce Stahn

RED

Review Committee - People min

Prosecutors Office RE-writing Doc

96-1742

CIP ROUTING SLIP

Project Name: Runway 13L-31R RehabProject Number: 001294**1.0 Design**

- ☐ 1.1 Proposal/RFP
- ☐ 1.2 Consultant Agreement
 - ☐ 1.2.1 Bonds/Insurance
 - ☐ 1.2.2 Amendments
 - ☐ 1.2.3 Contract Documents
- ☐ 1.3 Invoices/Progress Payments
- ☐ 1.4 Incoming Correspondence
- ☐ 1.5 Outgoing Correspondence
- ☐ 1.6 Record of Conversations (Phone/E-Mail)
- ☐ 1.7 Technical Reports
- ☐ 1.8 Drawings

2.0 Construction

- ☐ 2.1 Proposal/RFP
- ☐ 2.2 Contract
 - ☐ 2.2.1 Change Orders
 - ☐ 2.2.2 Contract Documents/Drawings
 - ☐ 2.2.3 Bonds/Insurance Certificates
 - ☐ 2.2.4 Permits/Licenses
- ☐ 2.3 Invoices/Progress Payment
- ☐ 2.4 Incoming Correspondence
- ☐ 2.5 Outgoing Correspondence
- ☐ 2.6 Record of Conversations (Phone/Email)
- ☐ 2.7 Quality Control/Technical Reports
- ☐ 2.8 Schedules
- ☐ 2.9 Record Documents (As-Built)
- ☐ 2.9.A O&M Manuals
- ☐ 2.9.B Photos
- ☐ 2.9.C Certified Payrolls/State Prevailing Wage Name: _____
- ☐ 2.9.D Field Notes
- ☐ 2.9.E Submittal No. _____

3.0 Outside Agencies

- ☐ 3.1 Incoming Correspondence
- ☐ 3.2 Outgoing Correspondence
- ☐ 3.3 Record of Conversations (Phone/Email)
- ☐ 3.4 Internal Correspondence
- ☐ 3.5 Quality Control Reports
- ☐ 3.6 Technical Reports
- ☐ 3.7 External Funding Reports

4.0 County Force Design

- ☐ 4.1 Proposal/RFP/Scope of Work
- ☐ 4.2 Work Authorization/Blanket Agreement
- ☐ 4.3 Internal Correspondence
- ☐ 4.4 Record of Conversations (Phone/Email)
- ☐ 4.5 Technical Reports

5.0 County Force Administration

- ☐ 5.1 Internal Correspondence
- ☐ 5.2 Record of Conversations (Phone/Email)
- ☐ 5.3 Project Closeout
- ☒ 5.4 Field Notes (Misc)

Requested By & Date Filed By & Date

**CIP ROUTING SLIP
PLANNING**

Project Name: _____

Project Number: _____

6.0 Planning

_____ 6.1 Project Scoping and Goals

_____ 6.2 Project Budget

_____ 6.3 Consultant Services

_____ 6.4 Proposal/RFP

_____ 6.5 Studies/Plans

_____ 6.5.1 Feasibility

_____ 6.5.2 Pre-Design

_____ 6.5.3 30 Percent Design

_____ 6.6 Coordination

_____ 6.6.1 Department

_____ 6.6.2 Agencies/Jurisdictions

_____ 6.6.3 Community

_____ 6.7 Correspondence

_____ 6.8 Technical Reports/Maps

_____ 6.9 Plans